

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-3 and 8-10 are amended and claims 12-15 are added. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,101,937 to Murakami. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Murakami fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in each of independent claims 1 and 10. With respect to claim 1, Murakami fails to disclose or suggest an ink-jet head for performing ink-jet printing onto the printing medium that has been subjected to screen-printing by the screen plate, in a state where the printing medium is supported on the supporting face of the printing medium supporting member. With respect to claim 10, Murakami fails to disclose or suggest an ink-jet printing step that prints by emitting ink of a darker color than the ink used during a screen printing step, onto the screen printed region, from an ink-jet head.

Page 2 of the Office Action states that the nozzles 9, 10 and 11 of Murakami correspond to an ink emission section for emitting ink onto the printing medium. Applicant respectfully submits that the nozzles 9, 10 and 11 of Murakami are not an ink-jet head and do not perform ink-jet printing because they are a part of a paste dispenser 8 for dispensing a surface mounting paste (col. 2, lines 64-67). Murakami only provides a screen printing machine that includes a paste dispenser for a surface mounting paste that is capable of distributing surface mounting paste evenly across the surface of a blank member to be printed (col. 1, lines 28-40). Further, Murakami does not refer to ink-jet printing.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Murakami fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1 and 10. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Murakami in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0122208 to Siegeritz. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Siegeritz, alone or in combination with Marukami does not disclose or suggest device or a process that is capable of performing both screen plate printing and ink-jet printing. Thus, Siegeritz fails to overcome the deficiencies of Murakami, as applied to claims 1 and 10, from which claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 11 depend. Siegeritz fails to provide any suggestion or motivation for combining the teachings of Siegeritz with Marukami to provide the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 1 and 10.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the combination of Murakami and Siegeritz fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 2, 3, 8, 9 and 11. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Murakami in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,631,985 to Koizumi et al. (Koizumi). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Koizumi discloses an ink-jet textile printing system that includes an ink-jet printing mechanism for printing on a printing object (Abstract). Koizumi fails to disclose or suggest a device or a process that is capable of performing both screen plate printing and ink-jet printing. Thus, Koizumi fails to identify and solve any other problems associated with a device or a process that is capable of performing both screen plate printing and ink-jet printing.

For at least these reason, Applicant submits that Koizumi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Murakami, as applied to claim 1, from which claims 4-7 and Koizumi fails to disclose and/or provide any suggestion or motivation for combining the teachings of Koizumi with Marukami to provide the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 1

and 10. Thus, the combination of Murakami and Koizumi fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claims 4-7. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that new claims 12-15 are allowable over the applied art at least because the applied references do not disclose or suggest a printing device having the combination of features recited in independent claim 12.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi  
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Date: July 1, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--